

Serial No. 10/814,566

REMARKS

The application has been amended to overcome the objections and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Retaining pin 50 of McCann "extends through pin hole 31 of sleeve ring 30, the position limiting hole 15 of the connecting rod 10 and the pin hole 21 of the control rod 20...while permitting rotation of the sleeve ring 30 and the control rod 20 relative to the connecting rod 10". Thus, the retaining apparatus of McCann locks and releases the wrench unit through the sleeve ring 30 sliding on the connecting rod 10 to control the retaining pin 50 and then to control the control rod 20. Thus, McCann does not face or solve the problems solved by the present invention.

According to the present invention, the protective sleeve 20 doesn't act to lock or release the socket, but only the button 12 is pushed by the user's hand directly to the released position. Further, the button 12 is surrounded by the protective sleeve 20. With claim 1 amended to positively recite the extension bar in a manner to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, claim 1 recites an extension bar which is not taught or suggested by McCann. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to further define the present invention in a manner to further distinguish the present invention over McCann. As an example and referring to Fig. 5, a height of the second portion of the button 12 is no greater than a thickness of the protective sleeve 20 as recited in claim 3. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 has been overcome for these separate and independent reasons. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/814,566

As retaining pin 50 of McCann is not pushed to differing heights, there is no reason to include the release hole 40 of Cerda except in an attempt to meet the recitations of claim 2 of the present application. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome for this separate and independent reason. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has cited the United States patents listed in NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED as C-E. By the lack of application of these references and others like them within the classes or subclasses searched, the Examiner apparently recognizes the clear patentability of the present invention over any of these references.

Therefore, since the claims of the present application have been shown to include limitations directed to the features of applicant's protective sleeve for use with extension bar which are neither shown, described, taught, nor alluded to in any of the references cited by the Examiner, whether those references are taken singly or in any combination, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 1-4, as amended, of the present application and to pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Bobby Hu


Alan D. Kamrath, Reg. No. 28,227
NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
Attorneys for Applicant
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820 International Centre
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tel: (612) 392-7306
Fax: (612) 349-6556

Dated: October 6, 2005.